

Amendments to the Drawings:

5 The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Fig.1 and Fig.3. These sheets, which include Fig.1 and Fig.3, replace the original sheets including Fig.1 and Fig.3. In Fig.1, the label "Prior Art" has been added as required by the Examiner. In Fig.3, a box associated with the previously visible label 210 has been added and includes the term "Real input device". A box associated with the previously visible label 208 has been also been added and includes the term "Computer system". Additionally, a box associated with the previously visible two labels 212 has been added and includes the term "Emulation input device". The Examiner required all changes and no new material has been introduced.

10

Attachment:	Replacement Sheet	2 page(s)
	Annotated Sheet Showing Changes	0 page(s)
	New Sheet	0 page(s)

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This is a full and timely response to the Office action of January 04, 2007. Claims 1, 3, 8, and 9 have been amended and claims 2 and 10-20 have been cancelled without disclaimer of any kind concerning their respective merits. Figs.1 and 3 have been amended as required, as
5 have the title and several paragraphs of the specification. No new material has been introduced. Reconsideration of the specification, drawings, and claims of the application is respectfully requested.

1. Background

10 Figs.1 and 3 have been objected to for reasons on the record. The title and several paragraphs of the specification have also been objected to for reasons on the record. Claims 1, 8, 11, 12, and 16 are objected to because of informalities. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Thomas et al. (6,671,756). Claims 11, 12, 13, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
15 as being unpatentable over Thomas and well know practices in the art.

2. Drawings

Fig.1 has been amended to include the label "Prior Art". Fig.3's index 208 has been labeled "Computer system", index 210 has been labeled as "Real input device", indexes 212
20 have been labeled as "Emulation input device", and a dashed box labeled as "Switch device" and 202 has been drawn around all elements of Fig.3 as required. The couplings associated with the third switch 228 have not been changed. Instead, paragraph [0031] has been amended to match the coupling depicted in Fig.3.

Reconsideration of the drawings under this objection is respectfully requested.

25

3. Specification

The title of the application has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Additionally, corresponding paragraphs of the specification have been amended as suggested by the Examiner in points a, b, c, d, e, f, g, h, i, and l of section 6 of the current Office action. As stated, paragraph [0031] has been amended to conform with the connections of Fig.3 as noted in point j. Additionally, as supported by Fig.3, a short description of the connections of the voltage signal b1 has been added to paragraph [0031]. Reconsideration of the specification is respectfully requested.

4. Claim objections

Claim 1 has been amended as suggested. Relevant portions of claim 8, and claims 11, 12, and 16 have been cancelled. Reconsideration of claims 1 and 8 is respectfully requested.

5. Claim rejection, 35 U.S.C. 112

Claim 17 has been cancelled.

6. Claim rejections 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 103(a)


Both remaining independent claims 1 and 8 have been amended to include specific element and coupling limitations found in the switch device of Fig.3 as originally filed. No new material has been introduced.

The applicant is unable to locate in Thomas or other known references alone or in combination a KVM switch comprising the specific elements and element couplings described in base claims 1 and 8 as amended. As only two of numerous possible examples, the Examiner cited Fig.13 of Thomas fails to disclose the control signal (43) coupled to fourth switch (71) or that the first switch (68) is controlled by the output of the fourth switch (71).

Therefore, for at least these reasons, the applicant believes that known references fail to specifically teach, suggest, or motivate every limitation of the device of claims 1 and 8 and respectfully request reconsideration of claims 1 and 3-9.

Appl. No. 10/711,000
Amdt. dated April 04, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 04, 2007

Sincerely yours,



Date: 04/04/2007

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

5 P.O. BOX 506, Merrifield, VA 22116, U.S.A.

Voice Mail: 302-729-1562

Facsimile: 806-498-6673

e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com

- 10 Note: Please leave a message in my voice mail if you need to talk to me. (The time in D.C. is 12 hours behind the Taiwan time, i.e. 9 AM in D.C. = 9 PM in Taiwan.)